



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,178	12/23/2004	Thierry Nuris	1022702-000256	5531
21839	7590	09/17/2008	EXAMINER	
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC			LEO, LEONARD R	
POST OFFICE BOX 1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			3744	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/17/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/502,178	NURIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leonard R. Leo	3744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 20-26,30,31 and 33-56 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 20-24,30,31,33-45 and 48-56 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 25,26,46 and 47 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 25, 2008 has been entered.

Claims 20-26, 30-31 and 33-56 are pending.

Claim Objections

Claim 50 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim lacks ending punctuation. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 22-24, 35-45 and 50-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hood, Jr., et al. Hood, Jr., et al discloses a vessel 42, a helical coil bundle 22 formed by a first segment 26 and a second segment 28 (Figure 5), and a distributor 44 and manifold 48 located within the vessel and having a radius substantially equal to the bending radius of the coil. The recitation of “for treating a viscous medium or for carrying out chemical reactions in viscous medium“ is considered to be a statement of intended use, even if claimed, does not merit

patentable weight unless the body of the claim refers back to, is defined by, or otherwise draws life and breadth from such intended use. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Regarding claims 22 and 43, Figure 5 of Hood, Jr., et al discloses the second bundle 32 is formed by two segments 34, 36.

Regarding claims 23 and 44, Figure 5 of Hood, Jr., et al discloses three segments 26, 28, 30 in the bundle 22.

Regarding claims 24, 45, the segments 26, 28 of Hood, Jr., et al have substantially the same length.

Regarding claims 35-38 and 52-55, the “process” limitations are considered to be functional recitations, wherein MPEP 2114 states, in part:

APPARATUS CLAIMS MUST BE STRUCTURALLY DISTINGUISHABLE FROM THE PRIOR ART
While features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board’s finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference); see also *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 212-13, 169 USPQ 226, 228-29 (CCPA 1971); *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). “[A]pparatus claims cover what a device *is*, not what a device *doesHewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original).

Regarding claims 40 and 42, Hood, Jr., et al discloses a second bundle 32 having a different bending radius from the first bundle 22.

Regarding claims 50-51, as permissibly gleaned from Figure 2, Hood, Jr., et al discloses the radius of the

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30-31, 33-34 and 48-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hood, Jr., et al in view of Ono et al.

Hood, Jr., et al discloses all the claimed limitations except an agitator.

Ono et al discloses a reactor comprising a vessel 1, heat exchanger 2 and agitator 5, 8, 9 for the purpose of improving heat exchange.

Since Hood, Jr., et al and Ono et al are both from the same field of endeavor and/or analogous art, the purpose disclosed by Ono et al would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Hood, Jr., et al.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Hood, Jr., et al an agitator for the purpose of improving heat exchange as recognized by Ono et al.

Regarding claims 31 and 49, Ono et al discloses shaft 12 suspending the agitator 8, 9 surrounding the heat exchanger 2 with inlet 3 and outlet 4 at the bottom of the vessel 1.

Regarding claims 33 and 50, the heat exchanger 2 of Ono et al is about 45% of the vessel radius.

Regarding claims 34 and 51, the specific radius of the bundle is considered to be an obvious design expedient, producing no new and/or unexpected results and solving no stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art would employ any radius of the bundle to achieve a desired amount of heat exchange.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 25-26 and 46-47 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

The rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is withdrawn in view of the amendment.

The rejections in view of Lameris are withdrawn in view of the amendments.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The rejection in view of Ono et al teaching an agitator for the purpose of improving heat exchange is deemed correct for lack of any argument by applicants.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonard R. Leo whose telephone number is (571) 272-4916. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/ LEONARD R. LEO /
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3744

September 16, 2008